

**REMARKS**

This Office Action follows the RCE filed on August 23, 2004. Method claims 1-3 are currently pending, and claims 4-6 (directed to the coating apparatus) remain withdrawn.

The prior art rejections from the previous Office Action have been repeated. Applicant notes that on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner provides a section entitled "Response to Arguments," but this section is blank (see top of page 5). Nonetheless, the Examiner did provide specific comments in response to the July 23, 2004, Amendment, specifically at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 of the Office Action.

The Examiner now takes the position that "...the final alignment/arrangement of the cords is accomplished immediately before coating by a narrow passageway/insertor in the extrusion head/die (see Fig. 3 below)." The "Fig. 3" referenced in the quote above appears on page 3 of the Office Action, and this figure is a modified version of Fig. 3 in Vinson in which the Examiner adds an arrow to show what he considers the "final alignment/arrangement of cords". The Examiner argues that the "final alignment/arrangement of the cords is evidenced by the linear spatial separation of the cords as shown in Fig. 4." Fig. 4 is a cross-sectional view taken along the line 4-4 in Fig. 3. Finally, the Examiner refers to the structure (extruder head) 122 in Fig. 3 of Vinson as the claimed "insertor", since "...the cords are passed through this structure or passageways as set forth above." See the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully submits that Figs. 3 and 4 of Vinson do not clearly indicate how or even whether the cords are arranged at a given pitch, as required by claim 1. Nevertheless, in order to clarify the claimed invention, claim 1 is hereby amended to recite that the cord units are arranged in parallel to each other at a given pitch in the same plane by an insertor (5) which is

fixedly secured within an insulator head (4) for applying the uncured rubber to the arranged cord units, as shown by way of example in Fig. 1B. In other words, the structure of the inserter and the insulator head are now recited in more detailed terms in claim 1. This structure is used to perform the process and thus forms part of the claimed process, as clearly recited in claim 1. Vinson is not so detailed in this regard. Specifically, Vinson fails to teach or fairly suggest the invention as now recited more particularly. In Vinson, there is no mention of an inserter that is received within an insulator head. At least that feature of the claimed invention is clearly missing from the cited art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Gruskin  
Registration No. 36,818